

Applicants : Jane H. Morse and James A. Knowles  
Serial No. : 09/904,380  
Filed : July 12, 2001  
Page 2

- IV. Claims 57 and 59, drawn to methods of screening for a compound and obtaining a composition; and
- V. Claim 60, drawn to a transgenic non-human animal.

In response, applicants hereby elect Group I, claims 1-52 and 56, with traverse for prosecution at this time.

REMARKS

Applicants, however, respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the restriction requirement. Under 35 U.S.C. §121, restriction may be required if two or more independent and distinct inventions are claimed in one application. Under M.P.E.P. §803, the Examiner must examine the application on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct inventions, if the search and examination can be made without serious burden.

The inventions of Groups I-V are not independent. Under M.P.E.P. §802.01, "independent" means there is no disclosed relationship between the subject matter claimed. The inventions of Groups I-V are all drawn to methods for detecting whether a subject is afflicted with, or predisposed for, a pulmonary disease. Applicants therefore maintain that Groups I-V are not independent and restriction is not proper.

Furthermore, under M.P.E.P. §803, the Examiner must examine the application on the merits if examination can be made without serious burden, even if the application would include claims to distinct or independent inventions. That is, there are two criteria for a proper requirement for restriction: (1) the invention must be independent and distinct, and (2) there must

Applicants : Jane H. Morse and James A. Knowles  
Serial No. : 09/904,380  
Filed : July 12, 2001  
Page 3

be a serious burden on the Examiner if restriction is not required.

Applicants respectfully submit that there would not be a serious burden on the Examiner if restriction were not required, because a search of the prior art relevant to the claims of Groups II-V would not require a serious burden once the prior art relevant to Group I has been identified.

Therefore, there would be no serious burden on the Examiner to examine Groups I-V together in the subject application. Hence, the Examiner must examine these Groups on the merits.

In view of the foregoing, applicants maintain that restriction is not proper under 35 U.S.C. §121 and respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the requirement for restriction.

If a telephone interview would be of assistance in advancing prosecution of the subject application, applicants' undersigned attorneys invite the Examiner to telephone them at the number provided below.

Applicants : Jane H. Morse and James A. Knowles  
Serial No. : 09/904,380  
Filed : July 12, 2001  
Page 4

No fee is deemed necessary in connection with the filing of this Communication. However, if any fee is required, authorization is hereby given to charge the amount of such fee to Deposit Account No. 03-3125.

Respectfully submitted,

John P. White  
Registration No. 28,678  
Alan J. Morrison  
Registration No. 37,399  
Attorneys for Applicants  
Cooper & Dunham LLP  
1185 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10036  
(212) 278-0400

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited this date with the U.S. Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents Washington, D.C. 20231.

Alan J. Morrison  
Reg. No. 37,399

10/10/02  
Date